

Appln. No.: 10/764,500  
Amendment dated October 12, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2007

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please replace Fig. 11 with the attached Replacement Sheet. Fig. 11 has been correctly labeled as "Prior Art." No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The office action of April 12, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 3-33 remain in this application. Claims 1, 3-20 and 24-30 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

#### **Objections to the Drawings**

Fig. 11 has been amended to change the label "Related Art" to read "Prior Art." A replacement sheet is submitted concurrently herewith. No new matter has been added.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-30 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action asserts that claims 1, 24, 30 and 32 are directed to a method that is taught to be an abstract idea. Preliminarily, Applicants did not find any teaching or suggestion in Applicants' specification that the methods of claims 1, 24, 30 and 32 are merely an abstract idea. Further, the methods of claims 1, 24, 30 and 32, and their dependent claims, recite useful, concrete and tangible results. Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 13-23, Applicants request clarification as to what the Examiner is objecting to as being non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action merely asserts, at p. 3, that Applicants' specification teaches that sections of a system may include software. No rationale is given for the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-9, 12-20 and 23-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,724,403 to Santoro et al. ("Santoro"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 relates to, *inter alia*, receiving a request to manipulate a selected tile in a sidebar, locating an appropriate manipulation rule in an appropriate

manipulation rule set based on the current status of the selected tile and content of the request, manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate rule, wherein the appropriate manipulation rule set is selected based on an identity of the manipulation requestor. Santoro does not teach or suggest such features. The Office Action asserts that Santoro discloses the features of selecting an appropriate rule set based on the identity of the manipulation request at Fig. 24 and col. 22, ll. 1-22. However, the cited figure and passages merely relate to customizing tile-content delivered by a server according to a rendering device. Even assuming, without conceding, that Santoro discloses a manipulation rule set, Santoro does not teach or suggest selecting the manipulation rule set based on *an identity of the requestor*, as recited in claim 1. Indeed, while Santoro discloses customization of tile-content for a rendering device of a requesting user, Santoro lacks any teaching or suggestion of selecting a manipulation rule set based on the identity of the requestor (e.g., the requesting user). Furthermore, Santoro also fails to teach or suggesting selecting a manipulation rule from the selected manipulation rule set based on a current status of the selected tile and a content of the manipulation request. The passages cited by the Office Action merely relate to configuring a tile such that a tile displays an envelope and the message "New Mail!" when an unread message has been received. Col. 9, ll. 11-16, Col. 13, ll. 1-6. Even assuming, without conceding, that the display of the envelope and the message is defined in a rule, Santoro still does not teach or suggest that such a rule is located from a manipulation rule set *based on a current status of a selected tile and a content of the manipulation request*, much less a manipulation rule set *selected based on an identity of the manipulation requestor*, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, one or more user manipulation rules defining an appropriate disposition of a selected tile based on a current status of the selected tile when a manipulation request originates from the system user and one or more application manipulation rules defining a disposition of the selected tile based on the current status of the selected tile when the manipulation request originates from the application. Santoro lacks a teaching or suggestion of such features. The citations provided by the Office Action merely identify, at best, examples of user and system interactions with tiles. *See, e.g.*, col. 3, ll. 35-41; col. 9, ll. 11-16. The Office Action fails to identify a single passage in Santoro that teaches or

suggests user manipulation rules that are used *when a manipulation request originates from a system user* and application manipulation rules used *when a manipulation request originates from an application*. Indeed, Santoro is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of a first set of one or more rules that defines a disposition of a tile when a manipulation request is received from a user and a second set of one or more rules defining a disposition of a tile when the request originates from an application rather than a user. Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, determining a current status of the selected tile in response to the application request and selecting an appropriate tile manipulation rule for the application based on the current status of the tile. The Office Action identifies several passages of Santoro that supposedly teach or suggest selection of an appropriate tile manipulation rule for the application based on a current status of the tile. Instead, the cited passages merely disclose that “each tile on the grid can show the current status of the data or datastream associated with it.” Col. 11, ll. 39-41. The mere display of a current status does not constitute basing a selection of a tile manipulation rule on the current status of the tile to be manipulated. Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claim 30 recites, *inter alia*, removing a selected tile from a sidebar upon receiving a user manipulation request and refusing a subsequent request from an application to insert the selected tile into the sidebar. The Office Action asserts that Santoro’s disclosure of using the drag and drop to remove tiles out of the Grid Wizard essentially bans the tiles from being displayed. Applicants disagree. Santoro offers no support for the alleged teaching of banning tiles from being displayed. Quite simply, Santoro does not teach or suggest banning tiles from being displayed as a result of removing tiles from a Grid Wizard using drag and drop. The Office Action is impermissibly reading features into Santoro in view of Applicants’ disclosure. Claim 30 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Independent claim 32 recites, *inter alia*, inserting a selected tile in a preferred sidebar position in response to a user request to insert the selected tile and inserting the selected tile in less preferred sidebar position in response to an application request to insert the selected tile. Santoro lacks a teaching or suggestion of inserting a selected tile in a less preferred sidebar position in response to an application request to insert the selected tile. In fact, Santoro offers no

distinction in the placement of a tile based on the identity of the requestor. The cited passage of Santoro (col. 3, ll. 35-41) merely discloses the ability to resize a display area and that active areas may include menu bars, scroll bars, or tool bars designed to allow the user to control aspects of the window's appearance. Indeed, nowhere in the cited passage or the remainder of Santoro does Santoro teach or suggest inserting a selected tile in a less preferred position in response to an application's request to insert the selected tile (i.e., as compared to a user's request). Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 3-9, 12, 14-20, 23, 25-29, 31 and 33 are dependent on claims 1, 13, 24, 30 and 32, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claim and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 10, 11, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santoro in view of U.S. patent no. 5,920,316 to Oran et al. ("Oran"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1 and thus incorporate all of the features of claim 1. As discussed above, Santoro fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Oran fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Santoro. Accordingly, claims 1 and 10-11 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 21 and 22 dependent from claim 13 and thus incorporate all of the features of claim 13. As discussed above, Santoro fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 13. Oran fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Santoro. Accordingly, claims 13, 21 and 22 are allowable for at least these reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 12, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/  
Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001

CAM:lab